

Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group



Ecology Headquarters
Room ROA-05
July 17, 2014

DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

Draft Meeting Notes

P	Andy	Rheume	City of Redmond		Jessica	Schwing	Ecology
x	Anne	Dettelbach	Ecology	VC	Jon	Morrow	City of Ellensburg
	Bill	Moore	Ecology	P	Laura	Merrill	Washington State Association of Counties
P	Bruce	Wulkan	Puget Sound Partnership		Pat	Brommer	Ecology
	Carl	Schroeder	Association of Washington Cities	x	Rebecca	Ponzio	Washington Environmental Council
	Darcy	Nonemacher	Washington Environmental Council		Rick	Romero	City of Spokane
x	Dave	Tucker	Kitsap County Public Works	P	Ron	Wierenga	Clark County
	Dawn	Anderson	Pierce County		David	Knight	Ecology
	Bill	Lief	Snohomish County		Gerry	O'Keefe	Washington Public Ports Association
	Nancy	Aldrich	West Richland	x	Marcia	Davis	City of Spokane
x	Jeff	Nejedley	Ecology		Janel	Bistrika	Ecology
x	Doug	Howie	Ecology	x	Jodi	Gearon	Ecology

Intros/Housekeeping/Review/Discuss Meeting Notes

No changes to June Meeting Notes

Preview of 2014 Legislative Session, Key Issues, Funding Pressures- Darcy, Carl

Purpose/Goal: Provide group with context for the development of the 2015 funding program.

Darcy and Carl were unable to attend the meeting. Item has been postponed.

Update on Ecology's 2015-17 Capital Budget Proposal - Jeff

Purpose/Goal: Provide group with context for the development of the 2015 funding program.

Ecology has put in a request for \$96M in bond funds and \$6M in MTCA funding. MTCA fund projections were lower than expected and over allocated with a high burn rate. These funds would be for a competitive grant program. Since this is a budget request, there are no earmarks. This is from a different budget than the GROSS grants and capacity funds and is not directly related to those funds. The Governor's budget is expected to be released in mid-December.

There is a multitude of factors that will influence the 15-17 budget:

- Multiple legislators are interested in the development of a larger water funding package which could include funding for water supply, flood control, and water quality.
- It is important to articulate stormwater needs to the legislature.
- The McCleary decision will likely effect funding availability.
- The state's bonding capacity is in good shape.
- Fish consumption is still a "wild card."

Discussion continued around the factors that would help support a successful bid for stormwater funds.

Key points included:

- It is important to have the conversation going both as part of Ecology's request and outside Ecology.
- Having successful projects as examples will be critical.
- Showing areas of statewide agreement
- Tying in the budget request with the Puget Sound Action Agenda
- APWA may also provide support

2:20 Value of Capacity/Pass-Through Grants - Jon

Purpose/Goal: Provide group with context for the development of the 2015 funding program

Jon provided an overview of some of the key issues surrounding capacity grants.

- Implementation of the new NPDES municipal permit may result in a 50% rate increase in Ellensburg – from \$260 to \$480
- Most of this burden will be on commercial rate payers
- Stormwater utilities have only recently been established in many communities (2000)
- Funding is needed to develop capacity
- Jurisdictions need to show the work they are accomplishing with Capacity Funds
- Too many rate increases will result in a loss of support for pollution control program
- It is difficult to plan long- term programs when political leadership changes often
- Both large and small towns face similar issues.
- Funding needs to be stable – at least 10 years.

The group discussed the current capacity grant funding. Capacity grants do not come out of the capital budget; they are included in Ecology's current operating budget.

Rebecca asked how communities on the west side get rate increases. Dave mentioned that is generally an easier sell on the Westside and Andy informed the group that Redmond had the highest rate in Washington, but they are the exception. Most communities have difficulty getting the political will to raise rates and many communities do not want capital construction dollars because new facilities raise operating costs.

Jon explained that E-side per capita income is lower, plus they don't get rain often. He has had questions from a local corn processor asking why they were considering rate hikes when the legislature just appropriated \$100M for SW.

Overview of Draft Benefit Comparison Tool –Doug

Purpose/Goal: Collect feedback on tool that is being developed by Ecology.

This tool provides a way to compare different projects to a standard re-redevelopment project even though retrofit projects are not required to meet new or redevelopment standards. Dave noted that that the tool may not back-calculate. Dave mentioned a GIS calculating tool that was created under the GROSS grant program that is available on the west side which does allow for calculation both ways. Ron agreed to take the tool back to his engineers for comments and noted that it is very similar to tools they are currently using with good success. Multiple group members were pleased at the movement towards standardization. Doug will also bring the tool to APWA to continue on the refinement.

3:00 Close the loop on Activities for 2014 program- update on next steps- Jessica

Purpose/Goal: Check in and keep everyone on the same page

Guidelines for the SFY16 are currently being finalized. Based on the last two meetings, activities that can show a direct/high level of water quality benefit that is clearly above and beyond permit requirements will be considered for funding. This may include sweeping programs, inspection of pre-permit private parcel BMPs, or legacy pollutant removal projects. Activities such as monitoring, education and outreach, planning, or IDDE will not be eligible.

Next Meeting TBD